



Minutes JRA/CA IPAC Subcommittee

Date: March 10th, 2010

In attendance:

Name	Tribe/Organization
Aliza Brown	Quinault Tribe
David Delmendo	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Liz Mueller	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Jim Sherrill	Cowlitz Tribe
Kim Miller	Skokomish Tribes
Monica Reeves	JRA, HQ
Betty Taaffe (phone)	Quileute Tribe
Rebecca Peck (phone)	Samish Tribe
Leslye Revey (phone)	Lummi Tribe
Jane Jorgenson	CA, HQ
Margo Gilmore (phone)	Quileute Tribe
Lorraine Van Brunt	Squaxin Island Tribe
Amy Finkbonner	Lummi Nation
Nancy Dufraine	CA-HQ, Lead ICW PM
Betsy Tulee	CA-HQ, ICW PM
Trudy Marcellay	OIP Region 6 South
Mike Yates	Cowlitz
Sandy Turner (phone)	CA,DCFS, Region 1
Gloria Green	Stillaguamish Tribe
Dana Young	Stillaguamish Tribe
LouAnn Carter	CA, Region 3, Supervisor
Roxanne Finney	CA, Region 4, ICW PM
Don Milligan (phone)	STOWW
Colleen Cawston	Director, Office of Indian Policy

Next meeting: April 14th, 2010

Location: DSHS/OB2

Room: SL04 (in basement near cafeteria)

1115 Washington St.

Olympia, WA. 98504

Conference Call in number: 360-407-3780 pin number 402219#

MINUTES:

Agenda Item	Discussion
<p>Introductions and Announcements</p>	<p>Liz noted the legislative bill 6740 passed which supports ICW law in state court systems. It does include a provision for qualified expert witnesses but does not address active efforts. The WSICWA was not submitted this legislative session. Senator Stevens showed an interest in the Indian Child Welfare law and spoke about including all children as it appears to be best practice. Don suggested developing a subcommittee to put structure around this. Liz agreed and suggested bringing it to IPAC and pulling in the IPAC Legislative subcommittee.</p>
<p>Citizen Review Panel</p> <p>Colette McCully, CA HQ</p>	<p>Per the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), each state is required to have Citizen Review Panels (CRP). The number of CRP's is dependant on the state's population. Washington State has three CRP's. This is the second year that the CA IPAC Subcommittee/ICW group is serving as a CRP.</p> <p>The requirements of a CRP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee is composed of volunteer members • Meetings occur at least quarterly • Examine CPS and Intake policies and procedures, and where appropriate specific cases. • Submit an annual report and include a summary of the panel's activities, as well as the recommendations of the panel based upon its activities and findings to improve child safety. The report is due to the Federal government in April. <p>This year there are six recommendations that include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to work on the development of the Washington State Indian Child Welfare Act. • Conduct the second ICW Case Review in September, 2009; ensure that the Case Review outcomes are communicated to all CA staff and that recommendations for the case review are clarified and that progress is reported out on a regular basis by RA's. • Develop mechanism to allow for tribal access to the CA, DSHS data system. • RA's will work with Tribes in their area to complete Local Tribal/State Agreements. • RA's will set up ICW and Quality Assurance training with Local LICWAC's and CPS and CWS workers. • Distribute copies of the most recent federal listing of designated tribal agents for ICWA notices. It is titled 'Federal Register, Tuesday, April 28, 2009, Part IV, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Child Welfare Act; Receipt of Designated Tribal Agents for Service of Notice. <p>Colette is pulling together the CA response to these recommendations. CA will then submit it to the CA IPAC SC for review and feedback. The report is due to the federal government in May with a final drop dead date in June.</p> <p>A recommendation was made to include early identification of Indian children, starting at the point of Intake for this upcoming year.</p> <p>Recommendations for this new year are due June 14th.</p> <p>Colette noted that Dr. Blake Jones is willing to speak to the Washington State CRP's. He is an expert on CRP's. The group is interested in this presentation.</p> <p>Colette will return for the May 12 CA IPAC SC meeting.</p>

<p>Tribal Access to FamLink</p> <p>Nancy Dufraime, CA HQ</p>	<p>Nancy thanked tribes for the quick turn around of the surveys regarding tribal access to FamLink.</p> <p>Nancy noted there is new legislation around HIPAA rules that pertain to data technology and hard copy information that will also need to be addressed in our data sharing agreements. Current timeline goal is to send out draft agreements, confidentiality forms, forms that sets up the user name to allow access by the end of the month. Then training dates and locations will be coordinated by tribes and the regions.</p> <p>Leslye asked about access to birth certificates. Nancy said she will check with Marie Gardipee who works at Department of Health This can also be brought up at the next joint IPAC-American Indian Health committee meeting.</p>
<p>ICW Case Review</p> <p>Liz Mueller, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe</p> <p>And</p> <p>Nancy Dufraime</p>	<p>Regional reviews occurred in all six regions during months of September, October and November, 2009. 217 cases were reviewed including CPS, FRS, FVS, and CFWS and included in home and out of home placement cases. 176 cases were reviewed during the 2007 case review. Some of the feedback in 2007 was to increase sample size so this was done. Each case was read by two persons, the questions remained the same as the 2007 review. Each review had about 10-12 reviewers including 15 volunteers from tribes and Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO’s), two from the Office of Indian Policy and 17 CA staff including AA’s and one RA. The regional reports and a statewide rollup have been completed and were all emailed out to tribes, RAIO’s, and the regions. Hard copies are being mailed to tribal leaders this week.</p> <p>After the 2007 review the implementation plan was uneven across the state. It was handled at the regional level which led to inconsistency. Nancy has submitted a proposal for funding to Casey to fund a day long work session to develop regional and statewide goals. The request includes funding for two members from each tribe, RAIO and region to travel to this one day meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested that even if Casey does not fund this, that this work day occur anyhow.</p>
<p>JRA Updates</p> <p>Monica Reeves</p> <p>JRA, HQ</p>	<p>JRA Budget –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiting to see what official supplemental budget dictates, but in the Senate Budget there is a suggested 3-year phase out of Maple Lane School. • 31K of the Tribal CJAA unobligated funds were taken as part of budget reductions. This reduction does not affect current tribal CJAA contracts, but could in the future if more tribes or RAIO’s are awarded grants. • The CJAA funds will continue to be administered through JRA rather than the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). <p>Evolution of Tribal CJAA Contracts –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JRA is reviewing contract requirements for the tribal CJAA contracts. The goal is to align the future contracts with the intent of the CJAA dollars (Evidence Based Programs and Promising Practices). JRA will be working on a communication plan with the tribes and RAIO’s to discuss what this evolution will look like and how the changes will affect the tribal contracts. There will be no changes to current contracts and any new changes will not take effect until the next contract cycle (FY11-13). <p>Tribal Youth Identification –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On a data pull last week, it showed that JRA currently had over 8% tribal affiliated youth in residence. This is an increase from past snap-shots. The increased number may possibly be due to the new tribal identification process implemented at

	<p>diagnostic (which asks each youth committed to JRA specifically if they are Native American or affiliated with a tribe, band or nation). Monica Reeves will be conducting some research to see if the recorded numbers have a direct connection to the implementation of the new process, or if, in fact, more Native American youth are being committed to JRA.</p>
<p>Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)</p> <p>Greg Dootsen, CA HQ</p>	<p>The Child and family Services Review is a process by which federal evaluators work with state personnel and community stakeholders to assess the infrastructure and child and family outcomes associated with child welfare systems in each state. The process includes broad scale stakeholder and staff collaboration on a statewide assessment, federal onsite review, and subsequent program improvement plan. Primary areas of focus include safety, permanency and well being.</p> <p>The review will also look at systemic issues including our data system, legal system and service array (availability of services).</p> <p>This upcoming CFSR is the second round for Washington State. Washington is the last state to participate. Lessons learned from first review; increased emphasis on involving tribes, youth and courts.</p> <p>The statewide assessment is due in July. Then prepare for the on site reviews. The on site reviews will include folks from outside of CA and CA staff. There will be two within King County (the largest metropolitan area is always reviewed) and two additional sites within the state that have yet to be identified. Of the additional sites one will be rural and the other will be a medium sized community. The on site reviews will occur September 13th through the 17th.</p> <p>Entities that will participate in the review include tribes (IPAC), parents, youth, foster parents, etc.</p> <p>Four main factors regions are working on are; stability; timely reunification; re-entry into the system; and service array (availability of services). The review will also look at individualization of service plans-can they be individualized to the family's needs.</p> <p>Case review data will be heavily relied upon.</p> <p>IPAC delegates involved in the CFSR include Matilda Sampson from AICC, Ronda Metcalf from Sauk Suiattle Tribe, Rebecca Peck of Samish Nation, Cheryl Miller of Skokomish Tribe and Liz Mueller of Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe.</p> <p>Tribes are also encouraged to participate at the regional level as well. Greg will send out a reminder to the regional staff at CA to outreach to tribes.</p>
<p>Transformation Design Committee (TDC)</p> <p>Jan Hoppler, CA HQ</p>	<p>In 2009 the legislature passed 2SHB 2106 that requires CA to change the way services to children and families are contracted. There are two phases; the first is labeled Performance Based Contracting and the second phase is Demonstrations Sites. CA is responsible for implementing Phase 1. The TDC is in charge of overseeing implementation of Phase 2. TDC meetings are open. Tribes and RAIO's (including IPAC members) are welcome. IPAC does have delegates on the TDC committee and subcommittees. Phase 1 will include changing structure of service contracts to performance based contracts. CA will retain case management during Phase 1. The current requirement is to get performance based contracts in place by January 1st, 2011. A bill on the Governor's desk 2SSB 6832 would move the start date out 6 months.</p> <p>During Phase 2, two areas of the state will be chosen as demonstration sites. Case management will be contracted out except CPS investigations and foster care licensing. This is scheduled to happen by July, 2012. (Again, a six month delay is likely.) Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) will measure outcomes of the demo sites.</p>

One point noted Liz noted was that in reviews of states that have implemented privatization of child welfare services outcomes in wealthier communities improved but this was not the case for poorer communities.

Jann and Nancy noted that CA plans to recommend:

- The status of ICW and IL contracts with Tribes and RAIO's not change and that they do not be included in the project. These funds would be reserved for inclusion in the Tribal Consolidated Contracts.
- That we determine what our current budget is for services for children and families under tribal jurisdiction and set aside that money to ensure continued access.

Questions that are not answered yet include;

- What about agencies/contracts affiliated with tribes (such as passport, visitation, CPA's, FPS, IFSS, passport etc.).
- Payment methodologies.
- How will we manage the lack of service array in remote areas?
- How will tribal children be served throughout the state including those from Washington state tribes that live away from their tribal community?

Some possibilities might include;

- Tribes or a consortium of tribes become master contractors.
- Assure Master Contractors are required serve tribal children throughout the state including those from Washington state tribes that live away from their tribal community

Gwen Gua asked about exempting Indian children from being included in the Phase 2 demonstration sites. Jann noted that would probably require a change in statute.

Liz Mueller, Gwen Gua and Trudy Marcellay attend the committee meetings and subcommittee meetings and all emphasized the importance of tribes and RAIO's getting involved as it will have a very big impact on service delivery to children and families.

The website at <http://www.joinhandsforchildren.org/> contains a schedule of meetings, minutes, conference calls etc.

The CA IPAC Subcommittee agreed to devote the next two afternoons to this topic. The next two CA IPAC Subcommittee meeting are April 14th and May 12th.

Assitant Secretary Revels Robinson and tribal leaders will be invited to participate as well.